

ZLOTER

# UNITED STATE PARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE

FILING DATE

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

172/23

022862 GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY SUITE L MENLO PARK CA 94025

09/150,251

TM11/1019

EXAMINER

SHANKAR, V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2673

DATE MAILED: 10/19/00

ÌΨ

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit	
—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—			
Period for Response			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a</li> <li>If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by defau</li> <li>Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by</li> </ul>	response within the statuto	ory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.	
Status/	1-1	((0,0,0)	
Mac Responsive to communication(s) filed on CPA G	led on	8-22-00	
☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .			
□ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
©Claim(s) 29-31		is/are pending in the application.	
Of the above claim(s) $1-28$ , $32133$		is/are withdrawn from consideration.	
		is/are rejected.	
□ Claim(s)			
		requirement.	
Application Papers	Deview DTO 040		
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.			
<ul> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is □ approved □ disapproved.</li> <li>□ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.</li> </ul>			
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
Priority_dnder 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)			
Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.			
□ received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) <u>09 1030, 825</u> □ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).			
*Certified copies not received:		·	
Attachment(s)			
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No.	s) 🗆 I	nterview Summary, PTO-413	
Notice of References Cited, PTO-892	•	Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	
□ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948		Other	
·	Office Action Summary		

U. S., Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 3-97)

Part of Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_\_

Application/Control Number: 09/150,251

Art Unit: 2673

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Continued Prosecution Application

1. The request filed on 8-22-00 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/150,251 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

### **Drawings**

2. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farel et al (4,697,050) in view of Stefik et al (4,814,552).

Regarding Claim 29, Farel et al (provided in first office action) teaches a transmitter device (30 in fig.2) for use with a system for digitizing operative strokes of a drawing implement,

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/150,251

Art Unit: 2673

the drawing implement having a body, an operative drawing tip, and a rear end opposite the operative drawing tip, the transmitter device comprising a housing having a front end and a rear end, the front end having an aperture, the housing including a removable cover portion for receiving a portion of the body of the drawing implement within the housing, with the operative drawing tip extending through the aperture (Figs. 2-3; summary; col.2, line 50 - col.3, line 68); a normally closed switch deployed so as to be opened by relative movement between the drawing implement and the housing resulting from the pressure applied to the operative drawing tip (Figs. 2-3; col.2, line 50- col.3, line 68); and a primary spring (42 in fig.2) deployed to bias the drawing implement to a forward position in which the normally closed switch is closed (Figs. 2-3; summary; col.2, line 50 - col.3, line 68). However, Farel et al does not teach the transmitter device is deployed to initiate transmission of a sequence of pulses in response to opening of the switch.

Stefik et al teaches the ultrasound position input device where the transmitter device is deployed to initiate transmission of a sequence of pulses in response to opening of the switch (Summary; Figs. 1A,1B,8; col.3, lines 22-57; col.7, lines 1-40).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teaching of Stefik et al into Farel et al for better handling of the drawing implement.

Application/Control Number: 09/150,251

Art Unit: 2673

Regarding Claim 30-31, Farel et al teaches that the transmitter comprises a secondary spring (32 in fig.2) deployed to act upon the drawing implement in a rearward direction so as to suspend the drawing implement within the housing (Figs. 2-3; col.2, line 50 - col.3, line 68).

- 5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 29-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VIJAY SHANKAR whose telephone number is (703)305-4763.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900. The Group's new FAX number is (703)308-9051. This FAX number is to be used <u>only</u> for Group 2700 papers.

VIJAY SHANKAR PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 2700